

### REMARKS

Claims 16, 17, 20 and 21 have been amended, claims 14, 15 and 22-26 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 27-37 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments. For instance, support for the amendments appears in the original claims of the application.

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is being filed under separate cover.

Claims 14-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Otsuka.

Claims 14-26 also were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Otsuka.

For the sake of brevity, the two rejections over the Otsuka document are addressed in combination. Each of the rejections is traversed.

Independent claim 16 does not overlap with the Otsuka document. Additionally, the Otsuka document does not provide any suggestion of the diseases or disorders recited in method claims 20 and 21.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested. See, for instance, *In re Marshall*, 198 USPQ at 346 ("[r]ejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art."). See also Section 2143.03 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.").

Claims 14-19, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Czarnocka-Janowicz et al.

Claims 14-19, 24 and 25 also were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Czarnocka-Janowicz et al.

Again, for the sake of brevity, the two rejections over the Czarnocka-Janowicz et al. document are addressed in combination. Each of the rejection is traversed.

Compounds recited in Applicants' pending claims are structurally distinct from Czarnocka-Janowicz et al. For instance, Applicants' claim 16 calls for n being at least two. This contrasts with the structure set forth at page 3 of the Office Action, where only a methylene (-CH<sub>2</sub>-) is present.

Additionally, Czarnocka-Janowicz et al. does not disclose or otherwise suggest diseases or disorders recited in method claims 20 and 21.

Claims 14 and 17-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Domiguez (U.S. Patent 5886191).

Compounds recited in Applicants' pending claims are structurally distinct from Domiguez. For instance, the pending claims do not provide for the bi-phenyl group as set forth at page 5 of the Office Action.

Additionally, the priority date of the present application is March 25, 1997, which is before any date of the Domiguez patent.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Claims 14, 16-19, 22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

To expedite prosecution, the claims have been amended without any limitation to obviate this rejection. The term "general" has been deleted from claim 16. Claims 14, 22, 23 and 25 have been cancelled without prejudice.

In view thereof, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Peter F. Corless', written in a cursive style.

Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)  
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205  
(617) 439-4444